Remarks .

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed February 15, 2007. The

Applicant gratefully acknowledges withdrawal by the Examiner of the previous objections

to the drawings and claims, and the withdrawal by the Examiner of the rejections of the

claims under §§102, 112.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

All pending claims 1-7, 9-18 and 20 stand finally rejected as being obvious over

various references. These rejections are respectfully traversed and will be discussed in turn.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-7 and 9-10

Independent claim 1 was finally rejected under §103(a) over U.S. Patent No.

5,875,180 to Hallmark et al. ("Hallmark '180) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,701,345

to Carley et al. ("Carley '345").

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the final Office Action, the

Examiner generally asserts that the single logon capability taught by Carley '345

results in the automatic activation of multiple IDs and passwords to access the

system. See final Office Action, p. 2, line 17 to page 3, line 6. This characterization

of Carley '345 is respectfully traversed.

While the Applicant generally agrees that Carley '345 teaches that it is

possible, albeit difficult, to coordinate multiple IDs and passwords associated with a

single logon ID, the Applicant submits that the single logon capability of Carley

'345 eliminates the need to execute multiple IDs and passwords. Therefore, the

#399005

6

single logon of Carley '345 <u>does not</u> result in the execution of multiple IDs and passwords, and indeed, Carley '345 directly teaches away from doing so.

The multiple IDs and passwords referenced by Carley '345 are described as being necessary when all of the resources <u>cannot be accessed by a single logon ID</u>. Carley '345, col. 130, lines 44-47. Carly '345 references the fact that *"most products on the market"* only permit *"access to only a subset of resources."* In such cases, Carley '345 indicates that *"single logons with multiple ID and password coordination may be difficult to achieve."* Col. 130, lines 47-52.

As a result, the system taught by Carley '345 provides a single logon capability ("One User-ID") that provides access to <u>all resources under a single logon ID</u>. That is, the single logon ID of Carley '345 provides *"access to <u>all software.</u>"* serves as a *"central point for <u>all security checking</u>,"* and uses a *"single user setup and sign-on capability across <u>all platforms and applications.</u>"* Carley '345, col. 130, lines 58-60; col. 131, lines 5-6 (emphasis added).

The system of Carley '345 thus solves the logistical and security problems associated with "multiple IDs and passwords" by providing a single user logon that provides access to all system resources as that logon ID, and eliminates the need for multiple user IDs and passwords. It is therefore incorrect to assert that Carley '345 teaches or suggests to execute multiple user IDs and passwords as a result of a single logon when Carley '345 clearly teaches the exact opposite.

Moreover, it is noted that the above reference to multiple user IDs and passwords by Carley '345 is in the context of the different IDs being necessary to access <u>different</u> subsets of resources. The multiple user IDs and passwords are <u>not used</u> if a single logon ID can

#399005   7

access all of the desired resources. See col. 130, lines 44-47.

Claim 1 features *"distributing a desired range of data values to be obtained from the database across a plurality of different query statements, the desired range accessible using a single login account of a computer network associated with the database."* The need identified by Carley '345 for multiple user IDs does not apply here, since all of the recited *"data values"* are *"accessible using a single login account."*

Moreover, nothing in Carley '345, alone or in combination with the other art of record, would motivate the skilled artisan to arrive at *"simultaneously executing the plurality of query statements to access said database and transfer associated data subsets into a memory space by logging into the computer network under a different login account for each query statement,"* as further recited by claim 1. Indeed, when different users logged into the system attempt to access the same resource, the system of Carley '345 suspends one of the processes to prevent such concurrent access. See e.g., FIG. 4 and col. 14, lines 24-34.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct over the art of record for the foregoing reasons. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and for the claims depending therefrom, are respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of Claims 11-18 and 20

Independent claim 11 was finally rejected under §103(a) over Hallmark '180 in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. US2002/0062310 to Marmor et al. ("Marmor '310"). This is also respectfully traversed.

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the final Office Action, the Examiner

#399005

PAGE 11/13 * RCVD AT 4/16/2007 5:15:07 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/33 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:4052329659 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-48

states that the final rejection of claim 11 is being sustained by merely combining the time to live (TTL) feature of Marmor '310 with the queries of Hallmark '180. See final Office Action, p. 3, lines 15-21. While the Applicant appreciates the detailed reasoning supplied by the Examiner in support of the rejection, the Applicant nevertheless respectfully submits that the above combination is insufficient to provide teachings and suggestions for all the limitations of claim 11, as required to establish a *prima facie* rejection via obviousness.

Claim 11 features, "*a query engine stored in a second memory space which, upon execution, distributes a desired range of data values to be obtained from the database across a plurality of different query statements, simultaneously executes the plurality of query statements to access the database and transfer associated data subsets into a third memory space, and arranges the associated data subsets to form the desired range of data values, wherein the query engine further initiates an auto-brake function that limits input/output transfer elapsed time to a maximum value during said transfers of the associated data subsets into the third memory space so that said transfers of the associated data subsets are interrupted when the maximum value is reached.*"

Claim 11 explicitly requires that the recited "*auto-brake function*" is initiated "*during said transfers of the associated data subsets into the third memory space*" so that "*said transfers of the associated data subsets are interrupted.*" The Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is obliged to construe this claim in accordance with the actual claim language presented, which recites the auto-brake function as occuring "*during*" the transfer of the associated data subsets "*into*" the third memory space.

As explained previously, the TTL feature of Marmor '310 is for lost queries that never reach the intended target. See e.g., Marmor '310, para [0031]. Merely combining

the TTL feature of Marmor '310 with the query features of Hallmark '180 would not result in the recited "*auto-brake function*," since the contribution from Marmor '310 in this scenario occurs <u>prior</u> to, not "during" the data transfer "into" the memory space as claimed. See Marmor '310, paras [0032]-[0034].

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is also patentably distinct over the art of record, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11, and for the claims depending therefrom, are solicited on this basis.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims pending in the application. This Response is intended to be a complete response to the final Office Action mailed February 15, 2007. Should any questions arise concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the below signed Attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____

Randall K. McCarthy, Registration No. 39,297
Fellers, Snider, Blankenship, Bailey and Tippens
100 N. Broadway, Suite 1700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
Telephone: (405) 232-0621
Facsimile: (405) 232-9659
Customer No. 33900

#399005

10